

SCM /Tender Ref #:	DPME 07/2021-22
---------------------------	-----------------

Request for proposals for:	Appointment of a service provider to conduct a diagnostic assessment on the state of planning in the national and provincial spheres of government and produce a diagnostic report.
-----------------------------------	---

1. BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

South Africa has made significant progress in setting up South Africa's national planning system and in building the capacity of the planning machinery across the public sector. However, there is concern that this has not had a sufficiently positive effect on improving service delivery and achieving the envisaged development results.

Despite a huge effort around planning systems, socio-economic transformation has been well below expectation. This can be attributed to a wide range of factors. Policy and implementation challenges, deep-seated and unequal social and economic structures, corruption and certain international trends have contributed to the country's inadequate progress towards development results.

The shift to a results-based approach in 2010 formalised the demand for outcome-oriented planning, monitoring and evaluation. This approach gave substance to government's intent to improve government performance through a better understanding of the results and evidence of whether implementation is occurring as intended.

It is envisaged that the next wave of planning reforms will more effectively institutionalise planning for development in the sixth democratic administration of government and beyond. The intention is to shift the planning system forward to more effectively direct the implementation of the country's development agenda through government's plans. It will also seek to improve participatory planning to ensure that the three spheres of government work collaboratively to develop aligned plans which contribute towards the country's development agenda and provide for collaboration with non-governmental stakeholders.

The planning system is governed by multiple policy directives, legislation, frameworks and regulations that are intended to inform and guide the formulation of institutional plans in the national, provincial and local government spheres of government and how they are reported against. By design, these legislative and policy prescripts, as a framework for government planning, rely upon intergovernmental cooperation and coordination. The products of these planning processes are expected to be periodically reported upon, monitored and annually verified as a part of an audit process. Institutional plans in the national and provincial spheres of government include Strategic Plans (SPs), Annual Performance Plans (APPs), Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) and Implementation Programme Plans.

The next wave of planning reforms builds on a number of key perceived strengths identified in the planning system within the national and provincial spheres of government. These include the following:

- a) The adoption of medium-term development plans (i.e. MTSF, PGDS and Sector Plans) to drive the implementation of development priorities, as reflected in the NDP 2030, in the national and provincial spheres of government without a legislative prescript that compels their implementation by institutions across these spheres of government;
- b) Existing legislation and policy prescripts provide for a mandatory, standardised approach to the development of institutional plans in the national and provincial spheres;
- c) Legally defined and functioning national budget allocation processes that distribute public funds in the national and provincial spheres of government to enable the implementation of institutional plans;
- d) The predictable release of statistical data by Statistics South Africa which are utilised for evidence-based planning;
- e) Each institution in the national and provincial spheres of government has a component in the organisational structure that includes functions for the development of institutional plans;
- f) Established structures in the national and provincial spheres of government for engagement on the institutional planning practice and planning processes.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND PURPOSE

Problem Statement

Despite the government's progress in establishing the components of development focused planning processes in the national and provincial spheres of government; evidence indicates that key concerns remain which include the following:

- a) The relationship between policy and planning is inadequate and the institutional plans in the national and provincial spheres of government are inadequately aligned with government's development priorities.
- b) The level of alignment of planning across spheres of government.
- c) Despite shifts, institutional planning remains largely compliance-focused.
- d) There are unaddressed planning capacity deficiencies which lead to ineffectively supported public sector planning for development results.

Several key components of government planning functions do not adequately contribute to the achievement of meaningful integrated development gains. Other key perceived weaknesses identified in planning system within the national and provincial spheres of government include the following:

- a) Superficial or rhetorical alignment and integration between development plans and institutional plans;
- b) Government institutions across and within the national and provincial spheres of government continue to develop plans that lack coherence. This includes instances where more than one government institution intervenes in a particular area or for particular beneficiaries in an uncoordinated manner to address the same challenge. In addition, this approach hampers the efficient utilisation of limited national resources;
- c) Inadequate use of evidence, knowledge and planning tools to inform planning decisions and the development of plans;
- d) Perverse incentives and malicious compliance with planning frameworks to achieve positive audit outcomes and performance results;
- e) Lack of linkages between both development plans and budget allocations;
- f) Inadequate capacity for both development planning and institutional planning in the national and provincial spheres of government.

Purpose

The purpose of the diagnostic research is to undertake a rigorous assessment of the state of planning in national and provincial government.

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

Objectives

- a) To identify key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the planning system, taking into account international standards and best practice; and to make recommendations on how to improve the planning system going forward.
- b) To determine the extent to which institutional plans aligned to development plans in the national and provincial spheres of government.
- c) To examine the extent to which planning processes and instruments contribute to the achievement of government priorities.
- d) To determine the effectiveness of planning processes which have been implemented to produce national and provincial medium-term development plans and the extent to which these are aligned to optimise results.
- e) To examine the extent to which planning is institutionalised and professionalised at national and provincial spheres of government.
- f) To provide recommendations on improvements to the planning system in the national and provincial spheres of government.

Scope of the Project

The scope of the Diagnostic Report includes:

- a) An assessment of the state of planning in the national and provincial spheres of government based on applicable legislative and policy prescripts; and norms and standards.
- b) Investigate different types of government planning (including strategic planning and development planning); planning policies, systems (processes and functions), institutional arrangements, coordination mechanisms, instruments, units (organisational structure), capacity, capabilities and practices.

- c) Assess changes over time based on available evidence (deterioration or improvement).
- d) Identify good practice and lessons to improve planning practice and systems.
- e) Make recommendations for policy interventions to improve performance and outcomes.

Time period under review:

The diagnostic report should assess the state of planning at national and provincial sphere of government from the inception of democracy until the end of the 2020/21 financial year.

High Level Research Questions:

- a) What are the current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, and trends in the planning system?
- b) What is the extent to which planning processes and instruments contribute to the achievement of government priorities?
- c) What is the effectiveness of planning processes and related instruments in the national and provincial sphere of government?
- d) What is the overall quality of planning in the national and provincial spheres of government, including in relation to the contribution of planning to development results?
- e) To what extent are provincial development plans aligned with the national medium and long-term plans?
- f) To what extent are institutional plans aligned with development plans?
- g) What is the extent that institutionalisation and professionalisation of planning in the national and provincial spheres of government?

Deliverables expected during the development of the Diagnostic Report

- a) An inception report that includes a detailed project plan, diagnostic design and methodology.
- b) Structured project team engagements in alignment to the project milestones.
- c) A monthly progress report for each month used to develop the diagnostic report. This must include a summary of field work undertaken and emerging results.
- d) Literature review which includes relevant theories, concepts and models, including on the relationship between planning and development; government planning policies, legislation, systems, capabilities and related matters and international good practice. The literature review must develop an analytical framework which will include thematic areas to be investigated in the diagnostic report.
- e) Report on methodology, including research strategy, sampling and approach to ethical considerations, data collection instruments and related documents. A mixed methods approach should be adopted.
- f) The Diagnostic Report structure must include the following minimum components:
 - I. Executive Summary
 - II. Introduction and Background
 - III. Diagnostic approach and methodology
 - IV. Literature review
 - V. An assessment of current developmental and institutional planning processes in the national and provincial spheres of government
 - VI. Findings and analysis in relation to key questions
 - VII. Overall conclusions
 - VIII. Recommendations
 - IX. References
- g) The first draft Diagnostic Report for review by the 15 December 2021.
- h) Participation in stakeholder engagements on the draft diagnostic report to validate and solicit feedback.
- i) The second draft Diagnostic Report for final review and inputs by DPME and OTPs by 31 January 2022.
- j) Content editing, proof reading and publishing into electronic format.
- k) Final Diagnostic Report, both full version and in 1/5/25 version, produced in electronic format by 4 March 2022.
- l) Provision of all datasets, metadata and documentation in electronic format produced during the development of the diagnostic report.
- m) An audio-visual presentation of the diagnostic report analysis, findings and recommendations.

4. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

The prospective service provider should propose an appropriate methodology to respond to the scope of the project. Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

- a) A literature review which identifies existing theories, concepts, models, frameworks, debates, best practices, and policies.
- b) The development of a conceptual framework/ theoretical framework.
- c) Methodology, which would include the overall research paradigm and strategy, the research design and methods, sampling, and the approach to data collection and analysis.
- d) Actual data collection and data analysis which result in overall findings.
- e) Interpretation and discussion, conclusion and recommendations.

5. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES

Description	Expected date	% of project (Payment)
Approved inception report (approval by Steering Committee)	After award/commence	5%
Service Provider contract signed	2 weeks later	-
Completion of literature review	2 weeks later	20%
Approved report structure, analytical framework, final data collection instruments (approval by Steering Committee)	2 weeks later	-
Approved First draft Diagnostic Report (approval by Steering Committee)	1 month later	25%
Stakeholder engagements on the draft diagnostic report	1 month later	-
Approved Second draft Diagnostic Report (approval by Steering Committee)	1 month later	20%
Approved Final Diagnostic Report, both full version and in 1/5/25 version, produced in electronic format (approval by Steering Committee)	1 month later	10%
Approved audio-visual presentation of the diagnostic report (approval by Steering Committee)	1 week later	-
Presentation of the Final Diagnostic Report to selected centre of government departments	1 week later	20%

6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT / REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

A Steering Committee will be established comprising DPME and other key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the end-to-end development of the Diagnostic Report including approving deliverables as reflected in section 5 of this TOR.

7. PEER REVIEW

Not Applicable.

8. OTHER

Not Applicable.